```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
 1
                      THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
 2
 3
 4 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 5
             Plaintiff,
                                     Criminal Action
                                      No. 04-10336-NMG
 6
  vs.
 7
  REYNALDO RIVERA,
9
              Defendant.
10
11
                         TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING
12
13
                BEFORE THE HONORABLE NATHANIEL M. GORTON
14
                      UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
16
                      United States District Court
                     John J. Moakley U.S. Courthouse
17
                             1 Courthouse Way
                      Boston, Massachusetts 02210
18
                              June 22, 2007
                                 3:45 p.m.
19
20
21
22
                     SHELLY M. KILLIAN, RPR, CM, CRR
23
                         Official Court Reporter
                     John J. Moakley U.S. Courthouse
24
                       1 Courthouse Way, Room 3510
                            Boston, MA 02210
25
                              (617) 737-7117
```

```
1 APPEARANCES:
 2 For the Plaintiff:
 3
        William F. Bloomer, AUSA
        United States Attorney's Office
 4
        John Joseph Moakley Federal Courthouse
        1 Courthouse Way, Suite 9200
        Boston, Massachusetts 02210
 5
 6 For the Defendant:
        Carl N. Donaldson, Esq.
        Carl Donaldson & Associates
        240 Commercial Street
 8
        Boston, Massachusetts 02109
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

PROCEEDINGS

1

2 (The following proceedings were held in open court 3 before the Honorable Nathaniel M. Gorton, United States District Judge, United States District Court, District of 4 5 Massachusetts, at the John J. Moakley United States Courthouse, 6 1 Courthouse Way, Boston, Massachusetts, on June 22, 2007.) 7 The defendant, Reynaldo Rivera, is present with 8 counsel. Assistant U.S. Attorney William Bloomer is present.) THE CLERK: All rise. United States District Court 9 for the District of Massachusetts, Court is now in Session. 10 11 For sentence, criminal matter 04-10366, United States versus 12 Reynaldo Rivera. 13 Would counsel please identify themselves for the 14 record. 15 MR. BLOOMER: Good afternoon, your Honor. William Bloomer for the United States. 16 17 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Bloomer. 18 MR. DONALDSON: Good afternoon, your Honor. Carl 19 Donaldson for Mr. Rivera. 20 THE COURT: Mr. Donaldson, Mr. Rivera. And we have a court interpreter. If he would introduce himself, please. 21 22 INTERPRETER: Gabriel Haddad. 23 (Gabriel Haddad, Interpreter, sworn) 24 THE COURT: And we have Miss Rofo, is it, from 25 Probation?

PROBATION OFFICER: Yes.

2.1

THE COURT: Please be seated. We are here on the sentencing of Mr. Reynaldo Rivera, and I have received and read the presentence report, the government's sentencing memorandum and the defendant's memorandum in aid of sentencing.

Is there anything that I haven't mentioned that I should have received in writing, Mr. Bloomer?

MR. BLOOMER: Nothing from the government.

THE COURT: Mr. Donaldson?

MR. DONALDSON: Nothing from the defense, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Then as I understand it, we obviously need to go through this three-prong process, the first of which is to establish the appropriate guideline range and then to consider whether any departures are warranted or any matters under 3553(a) would warrant a variance to a guideline sentence. I understand there have been a few objections filed by both the government and the defendants to the presentence report. And basically they all turn on, first, the amount of drugs to be attributed to this defendant,

Mr. Rivera, and then his role in the offense, whether or not a three-level increase should be granted or attached on the basis that Mr. Rivera was a manager of a substantial criminal enterprise.

As I understand it, the government has informed the

```
Court that it believes the amount of drugs that Mr. Rivera
should be charged with is the lower amount, that is, between
400 and 700 grams of heroin rather than in excess of 700 grams,
but that the Court -- the government apparently believes that
the amount is so close to 700 that it could go either way.
           Is that correct?
           MR. BLOOMER: That's right, your Honor. It's right
on the cusp of 700 grams. And where this was a case, as this
Court recalls, there were 12 defendants and there was a log jam
in that no one had pled quilty and with the exception of a
couple of defendants as the trial approached. And I felt that
the weight of the heroin was so close to 700 that perhaps the
benefit of the doubt would cut in favor of the defendant under
United States v. Sklar.
           THE COURT: And which of the particularly
attributed amounts of drugs would the government suggest brings
it back down to close to the 700 gram level?
           MR. BLOOMER: Well --
           THE COURT: Because apparently if you add them all
up, it's 735. So you're only 35 grams into that category.
           MR. BLOOMER: Only 35 grams into the category. The
one -- I think it was paragraph 90 where it described
Mr. Torrado -- a 50-gram pickup that was apparently
Mr. Santiago used Mr. Rivera's truck in order to leave some
drugs for Mr. Torrado. There was no indication about, you
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

know, the defendant knew how much drugs were going to be put there, what type of drugs or who was going to pick them up. was just can I use the office, meaning the car, and Rivera said yes. So it was kind of ambiguous. If there was one transaction you could say you can deduct, that would be it. THE COURT: All right, thank you. Mr. Donaldson, do you wish to address that issue? MR. DONALDSON: Yes, your Honor. If it please the Court. THE COURT: Yes, you may. MR. DONALDSON: With respect to the 50 grams that the government has just discussed, it wasn't any drugs, I believe, that was left in the office. He said he needed him to facilitate or that he wanted his friend to meet him -- his friend being Torrado -- to meet him up on the hill. I believe that's the way it was established. And that he told him that he had been waiting all day to receive those but that he would leave some food for, speaking in terms of drugs, that he would leave some food for him but that never took place. So that was the 50 grams. THE COURT: That was the one on September 30th? MR. DONALDSON: That would be September 30th, I didn't put that in my memorandum because I knew that the drugs was more than 400, but I knew assuredly that it was

less than 700. There was at least two or three other issues

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

```
that I brought to the Court's attention with respect to 80
 1
 2
      grams that there was a negotiation between Zuleima Reyes,
 3
      Mr. Rivera and Detective Chavez, the undercover agent.
                  THE COURT: That was the February 12th incident?
 4
 5
                 MR. DONALDSON: Yes.
                  THE COURT: And they were discussing how much he
 6
 7
      could purchase the drugs for. And the three of them agreed
 8
      upon a price but no drugs were ever purchased. There was never
      any meeting when they were going to get together to sell drugs,
 9
      any of that -- any of those things took place.
10
11
                  Also, your Honor, I pointed out on October the
12
      15th, 2004 when the officers arrested Zuleima Reyes, they found
13
      39.7 grams -- 39.6 grams at her residence. And she said she
      was holding those there for Rey. I would like to take
14
15
      exception to that for two reasons. If the government -- I
      mean, if the Court would believe that the 39.7 grams was in
16
17
      fact being held for Rey -- for Mr. Rivera, then that is close
      enough to the date of the purchase of the other grams of
18
19
      cocaine -- not cocaine, heroin. Excuse me, your Honor.
20
      Because on the -- I believe it was the 14th there was a
21
      purchase of 140 --
22
                  THE COURT:
                            180.
                 MR. DONALDSON: Well, there was 180 seized from
23
24
      Mr. Rivera's address. And I believe that there's a level of
```

double counting there. For example, there was a -- there was

a -- on the 13th there was a purchase of a hundred -- I want to make sure I have it right, your Honor. I have to go back to my note. On the 13th there was a purchase for 140 grams. And then they found another 18 grams at his house on the 10th -- on the 15th of August.

THE COURT: Okay. But he wasn't attributed that first 140. At least according to the presentence report, in paragraph 133 he is held accountable only for the 180 that was seized at the residence.

MR. DONALDSON: Right. And my suggestion is is that if -- but there was -- there was -- on 9/20/2004 there was also a person who bought 120 grams. My argument is you could look at it both ways. It could -- that 120 grams could be in the 140 grams. And the 39 -- that 39.7 grams, if she was holding it for Mr. Rivera, could be part of --

THE COURT: I understand your point.

MR. DONALDSON: Okay. The other issue is that with respect to this 39.7 grams is cut another way, your Honor, there is discussions on October the 29th -- I'm sorry, January the 29th, 2004 between Detective Chavez and Zuleima Reyes that Mr. Rivera and her were no longer working together and that she was on her own, that he had nothing to do with any more of those sales. And she was -- and he was to deal directly with her. And that occurred on the 29th. On the 30th of January he purchased 30 grams of heroin from Miss Reyes. They're also

2.1

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

attributing that 30 grams to Mr. Rivera as well. And then gathering those calculations would be the 80 grams, the 30 grams, the 39.7 grams, and the 50 grams would come up to approximately 249 grams off the 736 grams, which, again, we're still in between the 400 and 700 range, but we're not over the 700 range.

THE COURT: I understand. I understand your position. Well, the Court believes that there is enough ambiguity in the attribution of the amount of drugs attributable to Mr. Rivera that the -- under a preponderance of the evidence standard the Court will find that the amount attributed is under 700 grams but just barely. It seems to me it's very close to 700 grams. I do not accept all of the claims of Mr. Donaldson on behalf of the defendant, but I do accept the fact that there is enough ambiguity on several of them so that the Court would be best guided by finding the amount of drugs between 400 and 700 grams. I do for the record, however, note that the Court believes it's much closer to 700 than 400. And, therefore, I am not accepting the probation department's recommendation. And that means that under Guideline 2D1.1, which is the appropriate guideline that we're dealing with here, and particularly the 2006 manual which is the one that is recommended that we use, the appropriate base offense level would be 28 rather than the recommended 30.

There is now also an objection by the defendant to

the attribution of the three-level increase for the role in the offense under 3B1.1(b). There seems to be ample evidence that the Court is aware of that Mr. Rivera was, in fact, a manager or supervisor and that he supervised one or probably most likely two others who were involved in this very extensive 12 or more persons conspiracy to distribute heroin in the Lowell, Massachusetts area.

I've read your response to that, Mr. Donaldson, and I'll be glad to hear you if you wish to amplify your argument in that regard.

MR. DONALDSON: Thank you, your Honor. If it pleases the Court.

As your Honor is aware, your Honor has already stated that you find that there's ample, so I'm not going to belabor the point because I don't want to in any way appear that I'm disrespecting the Court.

THE COURT: You're entitled to your opinions,
Mr. Donaldson, and you can express them.

MR. DONALDSON: Okay, thank you, your Honor.

Number one, there is nothing in the record and with respect to the exhibits that I gave you that showed that there was any other -- any more of a decision-making authority over either one of the two individuals. That would be Arroyo or --

THE COURT: Reyes.

MR. DONALDSON: Reyes. And there is nothing in the

2.1

record that indicated that Mr. Rivera recruited those two individuals, and there's nothing in the record that indicated that he got or received a larger share of the profits with respect to those limited sells. There's nothing in the record, your Honor, that would indicate he had any degree of control or authority over either one of those two individuals.

What you have, your Honor, is -- if I can deal with Mr. Reyes first. Of the exhibits that I gave your Honor, it indicates by the understanding of Mr. Chavez that Miss Reyes was in fact Mr. Rivera's girl friend. They were in a boyfriend/girl friend relationship. And oftentimes, especially in these types of relationship, the business, they were partners, your Honor. They were partners. There is no street-level dealer who is going to give a source to a -- give a wholesale source -- give a source to their supplier and cut out their profit in that overall scheme.

In other words, what I'm saying is that if I'm the street-level dealer and I'm being supervised or managed by my supplier or my boss, I'm not going to -- because the only way I'm going to make my money is if I go out and sell the drugs, you know, what I get for them, I'm not going to take one of my clients and introduce them to my boss and tell my boss, look, this guy wants to buy large amounts of drug, what kind of price are you going to give him? And even if that was the case, there is no indication that Mr. Rivera paid her any money or

recruited her to do that.

2.1

There is no indication that Mr. Rivera controlled that whole situation. It's more that Detective Chavez -- of course that's his job. He controlled the situation along with Mr. Rivera because she wanted, as a general partner would do with another person you're in business with, is to say, look, how much can we sell these drugs to this person for? And they calculated what the drugs should be sold for. And that was consistent.

And if you look at some of the other discussions in there with respect to Mr. Rivera and Mr. Santiago, one of the of individuals who went to trial on this case, he asked her about Mr. -- and he specifically asked Mr. Rivera about Miss Reyes, and Mr. Rivera said we're not friends anymore. And she had indicated that earlier back in February that they weren't together anymore as well. But they actually had a business relationship and they were partners in that business relationship.

It appears based upon the sales, your Honor, that -- and it would appear at first glance that Mr. Rivera was a supervisor/manager over these two individuals or especially Miss Reyes. But then that would cut against, you know, women who are out here in this business as well. They're just as smart and just as intelligent. And it would cut against -- I would -- I would compare that to being a chauvinistic approach

to say that every woman who's involved with another person in drug transactions that they, you know, are always going to be the subordinate of the man. Sometimes there are women who are in these relationships and they are managers and supervisors. But in this particular situation they were co-partners in their endeavor.

On the other hand, your Honor, you have the one sell, Mr. Arroyo, back in December of 2003. Mr. Arroyo in December of 2003, basically he gets -- Detective Chavez makes a telephone call. He says that it's Mr. Rivera but he doesn't know for a fact that it's Mr. Rivera. He just assumes that it's Mr. Rivera because he has access to the telephone number. And later on that -- after that Mr. Rivera comes -- not Mr. Rivera, Mr. Arroyo comes and makes the sale. There's no indication that Mr. Rivera recruited him to make that sale, there's no indication that Mr. Rivera paid him to make that sale, there's no evidence on -- on the -- on the other hand either that he was just doing that as a favor for Mr. Rivera. There's no indication that Mr. Rivera -- that he actually even worked for Mr. Rivera other than any maybe self-serving statements that Arroyo said after he was arrested just to place the blame on someone.

But the facts taken into consideration, the total circumstances of this transaction, if he worked for Mr. Rivera, that would not only be the first time that he was able to work

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

for him. He would have worked on him in other indications.

There's no indications after all the phone taps and, you know, the pager taps that there would be some communications between Mr. Arroyo and Mr. Rivera. There is none. So it doesn't indicate that he actually recruited him or even that he worked for him or that he even had control over this individual.

What Mr. Rivera was was a distributor. He sold drugs; he bought drugs. Sometimes if Mr. Santiago needed to have some contact with Mr. Torrado, he'd ask him where Mr. Torrado was but only because Mr. Torrado and Mr. Rivera was friends. But Mr. Torrado cut his own deal with Mr. Santiago as well. And that's what we have here.

So under these circumstances, your Honor, I would not suggest that by a preponderance of the evidence that Mr. Rivera was a manager. I would suggest that he was no more than a middle man who was out there trying to make as much money as he could, and he did not under those circumstances have anybody working for him because he was taking the most money for himself.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Donaldson.

Mr. Bloomer?

MR. BLOOMER: My wife would be upset if I sought a role enhancement because I was a chauvinist. I would limit myself to the evidence and that is that the undercover agent negotiated a sale with Mr. Rivera, Mr. Rivera sent Mr. Santiago

2.1

Arroyo to consummate the sale. Whenever the undercover agent sought a price reduction or sought a large amount of heroin, Miss Reyes said she had to check with her guy and at one point referred to him as her boss and then reached out to Mr. Reyes. The fact --

THE COURT: You mean Mr. Rivera.

MR. Bloomer: Mr. Rivera. I'm sorry. The fact that they had a relationship as well doesn't mean that he can't be her supervisor. The evidence shows that he supervised Miss Reyes, sent her to consummate the deals, and whatever negotiations went through Miss Reyes had to get Mr. Rivera's permission or authority to either lower the price or to get large amounts of heroin.

I just want to clarify one thing. Mr. Donaldson indicates that Miss Reyes said she was no longer with him or dealing with Mr. Rivera. The evidence is that when they were negotiating the 80-gram delivery, there was -- there was some negotiation about the price. Ms. Reyes, the information showed contact with Mr. Rivera; Mr. Rivera then showed contact with Mr. Santiago. Mr. Santiago then came to Mr. Rivera's house. There was conversation that they were all set for the deal. And because we had had enough information to get a wiretap and we didn't want to spend another X thousands of dollars, we cancelled the sale. There was an indication in subsequent conversations that Ms. Reyes and Mr. Rivera were very upset

2.1

that that sale was cancelled and that ultimately it ended with a call we're not doing that anymore. Click. That was the call Mr. Donaldson was referring to in February. After that we went up on wires.

So I would suggest clearly by a preponderance of the evidence he's worthy of a role enhancement.

THE COURT: Mr. Donaldson?

MR. DONALDSON: If I may, your Honor. As

Mr. Bloomer indicated that they were upset, it wasn't that

Mr. Rivera was just upset. I'd also like to point your Honor

to 3B1.1 comment note 4, which indicates that, you know, terms

such as boss or leader, of that nature, terms of that nature

are not controlling with respect to these issues as it relates

to roles --

THE COURT: They're not controlling but they are evidence, are they not, Mr. Donaldson?

MR. DONALDSON: They are evidence, your Honor.

That's why I say in the totality of the circumstances, if we're going to cut it one way or the other, I think a liberal reading of all the evidence would indicate that he was not the manager, that he was no more than a distributor.

THE COURT: Well, the Court respectfully disagrees with defendant's counsel and finds that Mr. Rivera was, in fact, a manager as that term is defined in the Sentencing Guidelines at 3B1.1(b), which instructs the Court that if the

2.1

defendant was a manager or supervisor but not an organizer or leader and the criminal activity involved five or more participants or was otherwise extensive, then I am to increase the base offense level by three.

The Court finds that Mr. Rivera qualifies as a manager or supervisor in this case clearly over an extended period of time, and on the basis of the preponderance of the evidence standard, the Court so finds. Therefore, a three-level aggravating role adjustment is made. And that means that the adjusted offense level is 33. The defendant is, in turn, entitled to a three-level downward adjustment for acceptance --

MR. DONALDSON: Excuse me, your Honor. I apologize. You said the adjusted level would be 33.

THE COURT: I misspoke. It should be 31. Thank you, Mr. Donaldson. Because we started at 28. I stand corrected. We go from 28 to 31 for the adjustment in the role in the offense and then back to 28 for a three-level downward adjustment for acceptance of responsibility, and that's the total offense level that the Court finds.

There is no criminal history, or at least no recorded convictions, and therefore the defendant falls in Criminal History Category I. And that means that for the purposes of the guideline at 28-1, it would be a 78 to 97-month range for sentencing.

2.1

```
I will hear counsel. I understand there are no
 1
 2
      motions for a departure under the guidelines. Is that correct,
 3
      Mr. Donaldson?
                 MR. DONALDSON: Well, your Honor, I wasn't asking
 4
 5
      for a departure. I was asking for a variance.
 6
                  THE COURT: I understand. We will get to that, but
 7
      I need to go through the steps.
 8
                  And the government doesn't have anything with
      respect to departure, correct?
 9
10
                 MR. BLOOMER: No.
11
                  THE COURT: Now, Mr. Donaldson I'll hear you as to
12
      why I should vary this sentence from the guideline sentence if
13
      you wish to address that issue.
14
                 MR. DONALDSON: Okay. Your Honor, there are
15
      several reasons why I'm asking the Court to vary the sentence
16
      and take it out of the base offense level of 28. The first
17
      reason, your Honor, and I think that I can deal with this issue
18
      quite succinctly, is the issue that as I pointed out in my
19
      memorandum, there was some time in February of -- I want to say
20
      2005 -- it was --
2.1
                  THE COURT: The incident was in '04. He was
      arrested in October of '04.
22
23
                 MR. DONALDSON: Right. I want to make sure that --
2.4
      2006, your Honor. I have been in some discussions, basic,
25
      rudimentary discussions with the government about Mr. Rivera
```

cooperating with the government with respect to opportunity for a 5K1 departure. And I advised him that I would get back to him. We did have a scheduled meeting for, I believe, sometime around February 4th or sometime in that area. But during that period of time, I can't remember exactly, but there was a huge snowstorm and there was a lot of things that had closed down. Our schedules kind of conflicted, and then sometime in March of 2006 is when the police officers came to Mr. Rivera's house, entered his house under the pretext that they had heard of some complaints.

At that point in time, Mr. Rivera was at home alone with his now 6-year-old child. They took Mr. Rivera, separated him from his 6-year-old child, took the 6-year-old child upstairs into the bedroom by himself and I think either one or two other agents. And there was another three or four agents that stayed downstairs with Mr. Rivera and continued to question Mr. Rivera, can you buy drugs for us? Can you get drugs for us? We want to get some drugs. How soon can you get some drugs for us? And at all times he kept telling them that he was on probation, he doesn't do that stuff, he's on house confinement with the exception of going to work, if they have any questions, they should be contacting his attorney. He called me incessantly the whole time that everything was going on because he had his phone underneath the table, he kept redialing my phone.

2.1

When I came out of my meeting I looked at all these calls, I called him and asked him what was going on. He told me just what I just told you. I called pretrial probation services. I questioned pretrial probation services. The probation officer was Chris Wylie at the time. I asked him why are you sending police officers out to my client? And he says he doesn't know anything about it. So he said he would contact the necessary people and get back with me and let me know. Needless to say, the police officers at that point in time, state, federal were not honest with him as well.

THE COURT: They were not what?

MR. DONALDSON: They were not honest with Mr. Wylie as well. They gave him no information. At this point in time the mother and father and the wife of Mr. Rivera came home because that's where he was living. Under the terms and conditions of pretrial probation, he was to stay with his parents. They came home. Everybody was scared at this point in time. Mr. Chris Wylie had no indication, couldn't tell us whether or not these were police officers or whether they weren't because as far as Mr. Wylie was concerned, they weren't police officers because all of the authorities that he contacted, including the Lowell Police Department, the State Police barracks and all around, no one gave him any information to ensure him that that was a police activity. So at that point in time Mr. Wylie made the decision in fear of the safety

2.1

of Mr. Rivera, his two children, his wife, his father and his mother, removed them from the house and put them in a safe hotel for over the weekend until we were able to conduct an investigation that following Monday to determine what was happening.

Needless to say, your Honor, that type of activity is so outrageous that it would shock the conscience of any court when a person like that is under probation, especially the terms and conditions of probation where he's not to have any contact with anybody. Not only that, that they knew that he was represented by counsel. Notwithstanding those Sixth Amendment, those basic issues, they came into his house and violated his constitutional rights.

But there's another issue, your Honor. Mr. Rivera was involved in a very, very dirty business. There's no -that's why we're here, and that's why he's going to be punished today. But his family, his mother and father, they didn't sign up for that. He was not living with them when he was involved in that business. They signed up -- they signed up with the Court to supervise him and to be responsible for him while he was in custody or under pretrial release. What the government did was they intruded this house and basically scared the living day lights out of him, scared for his children, for his wife, his father and his mother to the point that Mr. Rivera was chilled at that point in time whether he could even trust

the government, to whether he could even function under a 5K1 proffer because at this point in time no one was prepared to be honest with him.

Your Honor, under those circumstances, I believe that this is an atypical type of situation that would take this case out of the heartland of normal cases and that he should be able to be sentenced as if he was going to give a -- as if he was going to cooperate with the government for purposes of a 5K1 departure. I didn't ask for departure because technically it's not a departure if he doesn't cooperate. And then the government would have to motion for that. So there's no way that we could do it.

So my suggestion, your Honor, would be -- I'm requesting a variance based upon that, your Honor. The reason why I'm requesting a variance based upon that is because constitutionally he was chilled from even being able to participate in that process, to participate in sitting down with the government, going with the government with respect to how he obtained his drugs from Mr. Santiago, with respect to how he sold his drugs, with respect to what he knew about Mr. Santiago. The government told me explicitly that if they were going to give him anything, that he would have to testify against Mr. Santiago. That's the conversation that I had with Mr. Rivera. That's the first issue, your Honor.

The second issue, your Honor, is that I believe

2.1

that if your Honor would take a careful consideration and take a look at Mr. Rivera's age, he's 28 years old. At his educational level. He graduated from high school in Puerto Rico. He came to the United States with a license to perform electric -- electricity duties and while he was here he got a license to be a forklift driver.

Now, Mr. Rivera was doing electrical work and forklifting duties at Kmart. He got laid off and he was living with his wife and his two children. During that time, your Honor, after he got laid off, he made the selfish decision to go out and start selling drugs, more specifically poison in the terrible drug of heroin, which is one of the most terrible drugs that we all know of. It's definitely in the top two, three worst drugs that anybody can take. He made that self-decision. He accepted that responsibility, your Honor. He said that he was guilty.

I enlightened him on the issues with respect to when police come into your house and all that. He could have done a lot of different things with respect to how when the police came into the house illegally. But he didn't. He said this is what happened, I'm going to tell you the truth from this point forward, I'm going to be honest about everything, I made the wrong decision, I caused a lot of pain with respect to my children, they had to sacrifice, they didn't ask for this, my wife didn't ask for it, my parents really didn't ask for it,

2.1

2.1

and I made these bad decisions and I'm going to stand up like a man and I'm going to take responsibility for it. So he's -- at this point in time he's not making any lies, your Honor. The only thing he wants to do is he wants to pay for what he's done and get his life straight again.

When I say "these things," your Honor, we take a look at his record when he was out on pretrial probation.

Within six months while he was on pretrial probation, he was allowed to have gainful employment, your Honor. While he was out on gainful employment, your Honor, he worked two jobs.

First job he was working -- he worked delivering glass windshields for cars. After that he started repairing auto windshields. And his bosses took enough respect and enough trust in him that they gave him that opportunity to do that.

And they taught him how to do that and taught him how to even open up his own business if he wanted to.

I would also suggest, your Honor, that not only did he do that but he was given the responsibility to leave his house at 7:00 in the morning and to get home before 6. And he had to drive all the way down to Quincy. Sometimes -- and his whole area was all of Massachusetts. But no matter what, your Honor, he would make sure that he did his job in a way that he would get home not later than 6. And if he was going to be between 6 and 6:30, notwithstanding the rush hours on these highways and everything, he would always call his probation

officer. I'm sure your Honor saw the date of sentencing where Probation Officer Wylie represented that Mr. Rivera -- let me see if I have it here. I moved my stuff around when the other attorneys came on the other case. I'd just like to read it for the Court. If I can have just one second, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

(Pause.)

2.1

MR. DONALDSON: Okay, your Honor. On October 16, 2006 authored by Christopher R. Reilly, he indicated that Mr. Rivera has been in full compliance with his bail conditions and checked with Massachusetts Criminal History Board there's no new warrants, no new arrests while on his release. And I'm saying all these things, your Honor, is to say that he started his part of rehabilitation before he -- while he was out on pretrial probation before he said that he was guilty. He started his part of rehabilitation. And I would suggest, your Honor, that in looking at the U.S. sentencing Commission on measuring recidivism, it clearly indicates that someone that is in a -- between the ages of 26 and 30 years old with zero criminal history points and has a very, very small chance to get back in trouble, to get rearrested on issues.

And I would suggest, your Honor, that his is even less than that because he already has licenses, he already has, you know, a semi-career. You know, he knows electricity. He now knows how to fix windows. And he has indicated to me that

as soon as he gets placed into a facility, a jail, that he's going to further his education on electricity and see if he can get any other type of licensing and degrees that he can get while he's in there. So I would suggest, your Honor, that you take that into consideration.

You also take into consideration, your Honor, the fact that Mr. Rivera has a very, very strong family -- knit family group. His mother and his father have supported him a hundred percent through this whole process. His wife is still here through this whole process. Again, this happened back in 2004. She's aware that, you know, he was involved with a relationship with somebody else during that period of time when they were selling drugs, but she is there for him and she's -- and they're still together as husband and wife. And, you know, he has that financial support as well as the emotional support that he needs to be when he comes out to be a good, strong citizen so that he can come out and work without having to worry about getting in trouble.

I'm sure that his family -- and his father's already indicated to me that, you know, he would do anything that he can to make sure that when Rey does come out of jail, that he is going to ask his boss to give him a job or at least try to, you know, put him in touch with other individuals that are in positions that can help him find gainful employment when he gets out.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Donaldson. 1 2 Mr. Bloomer? 3 MR. BLOOMER: I'm not sure where to begin, your Honor. I don't know if the Court wants to --4 5 THE COURT: What about this incident in February of 6 '06. How does the government respond to that having an impact on this sentencing? 8 MR. BLOOMER: I have no idea how it has an impact on the sentencing. It's been my position all along that that 9 10 is irrelevant, it had no impact -- this is not the forum, this 11 is not the proceeding to address that. Mr. Donaldson said that 12 we had basic rudimentary discussions about a possible plea 13 before this interest -- this incident. That is generous to say 14 the least. We talked on the phone a couple of times. I made 15 it clear to Mr. Donaldson that it was the government's 16 position, number one, that he was not safety valve eligible 17 because he was a manager or a supervisor and, therefore, 18 anything he told us that he was not getting, in my view, a 19 safety valve departure. 20 Number two, yes, it would involve him having to 2.1 testify against Mr. Santiago because that's the only way he 22 could have gotten a departure. However, we never got to the 23 point as to whether or not Mr. Rivera was going to testify 24 against Mr. Santiago. As a matter of fact, the indications

were that he would not. We had -- and after I received this --

I just want to say that I got this late, Judge. The filings weren't even given to me. I had to go to the clerk's office to get this. After I got it, I went through my notes to determine exactly what happened. In January --

MR. DONALDSON: I apologize, your Honor. But this is one issue. I hand delivered this up to his office the same day that I was down here. So --

THE COURT: That was no more than two days ago, which was late to begin with, Mr. Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: Yes. Yes.

MR. BLOOMER: I'm referring to the motion to continue, your Honor, where it lays it out in the affidavit exactly what he alleged happened.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BLOOMER: The end of January I spoke with Mr. Donaldson. We agreed to set up a meeting to determine whether or not Mr. Rivera would come in for a meeting in early September. Mr. Donaldson didn't come for that meeting. I'm not sure what happened, but he didn't show up for the meeting. I tried to call him on a number of different occasions, did not get returned calls. Time went by. The end of March, my understanding is I left the office for Friday. I come in on Monday, I got a call from Chris Wylie saying the police paid Mr. Rivera a visit. I called various police agencies, found out that the Lowell police in fact responded to what I was told

were reports of unduly loud noise and neighbor complaints to Mr. Rivera's parents' house. And when they responded, they were surprised to see Mr. Rivera there. They thought that he was held on pretrial detention. So I reported that to the Court. I had no prior knowledge that that had occurred. And I reported to Mr. Wylie exactly what happened.

I have no idea how this affects the sentence. I really don't, Judge. There was no indication, and this Court knows, not one person in this case cooperated. We had 12 defendants. Out of 12 defendants zero cooperated and they expressed fear of Mr. Santiago and retribution had they testified. All indications to me was that Mr. Rivera was not going to testify. He was not interested in that. And, as a matter of fact, the trial in this case started on October 15th of 2006. October 12th was the day that I was informed that Mr. Rivera was going to plea and that there would be no plea agreement, that he was just going to plea straight up. I don't understand how this visit from the police, even if it wasn't proper, impacts sentencing.

I bring the Court back, Judge, to the facts of the case and that this defendant was the primary -- and I say the primary long-term customer of Mr. Santiago. The investigation, in fact, began in response to complaints of drug dealing involving Mr. Rivera and Mr. Santiago. That's how this whole investigation began. When they execute a search warrant at the

end of the investigation, 180 grams of heroin, a finger press -- this Court remembers, I'm sure, the expert, Trooper Shapiro, demonstrating how that finger press worked, that black finger press in his residence, latex gloves, actually boxes of fingers that had been precut were found, a digital scale, \$3,200 in cash.

Judge, this is a serious offense that demands, I suggest, severe punishment. Ninety-seven months I suggest to this Court is reasonable. Why do I say 97 months? Because when I looked at the GSR based upon what I thought was the appropriate weight and I compared to what probation came up with, 97 months overlapped. In other words, for the base offense level for 30 it was 97 to 121; for 28 it was 78 to 97. And where he was found responsible for close to 700 grams of heroin, I felt that 97 months was a fair and reasonable sentence for this individual to serve given the severity of the offense and his role in this offense.

And I would harken the Court to the sentences that have been meted out today. That 97 months I suggest is perfect. When we look at Santiago receiving 248 months; his supplier, Juan Nunez, getting 151 months; another major customer, Carlos Sanchez, getting 127 months; a career offender getting 264 months. And then you have the lower level players such as Zuleima Reyes getting 36 months; Torrez 36 months; Pedro Miranda 72 months. The 97 months here for Mr. Rivera is

a fair and it is a reasonable sentence and it was one that will promote respect for the law and it was one that will protect the public from this defendant.

THE COURT: All right, thank you.

First, I am not going to enter a variant sentence in this case. I do not see any grounds for an outside-the-guidelines sentence. If the incident that occurred in February '06 was as described by Mr. Donaldson, then perhaps the parents or anyone else who was present that has a claim against the Lowell Police Department under Section 1983, but to me it does not impact this sentence in any way. The Court will, therefore, sentence within the guidelines. I've already heard the government's recommendation for sentencing within the guidelines. I'll hear Mr. Donaldson briefly if he wishes to address the Court.

MR. DONALDSON: Your Honor, if your Honor would sentence him within reference to the advisory guidelines.

Again I would ask your Honor to take into consideration the 3553(a) considerations, your Honor, with respect to Mr. Rivera's -- his overall issues with respect to him as a person, your Honor.

But if we're just basically talking about the basic advisory guideline sentence, I would suggest, your Honor, that he be sentenced to the low range of the guidelines. And I believe that the low range is 78 months. And I would ask for

that to be also consistent with the similarly situated other defendants, your Honor.

I would also indicate that Mr. Torrado, who is also considered to be one of the larger scale but on the same level as Mr. Rivera, I believe that he got a five-year sentence.

That was by a plea agreement, your Honor. But the other individual, he got a 72-month sentence. So I would suggest, your Honor, that he would be -- that he would be given a 72-month sentence if your Honor was to go below -- if your Honor was to go below, but to give a 78 if you weren't willing to go below the sentence, your Honor. I would also ask that he be given an opportunity to have credit for the drug program as well.

THE COURT: All right. Does the defendant wish to address the Court before sentence is imposed?

MR. DONALDSON: He had indicated to me, your Honor, that he would like to address the Court. His father and his wife also indicated that they would like to address the Court.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not going to hear from the father and the wife. I will hear from the defendant.

THE DEFENDANT: I'd like to apologize to the government, the United States, and to society at large for the harm that I committed. I apologize to my family for the bad times that I had them go through due to this situation, to ask you, your Honor, that my punishment would be as lenient as

2.1

possible, not for me but for my children and my family, who we 1 2 all need each other. That will be all. Thank you. 3 THE COURT: Do counsel have any reason why sentence ought not to be imposed at this time? 4 5 MR. BLOOMER: No, your Honor. 6 MR. DONALDSON: Not at this time, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: All right. The government in its brief made a recommendation for a fine, Mr. Bloomer. Is there any 8 evidence that the defendant has the ability to pay a fine? 9 MR. BLOOMER: I leave that to the Court's 10 11 discretion, your Honor. At the time I wrote the sentencing 12 memo, I'm sure I looked at the PSR in arriving at that. 13 THE COURT: Well, I don't see a net worth that 14 warrants it, Mr. Bloomer, unless you know something I don't. 15 MR. BLOOMER: No, your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Please stand, Mr. Rivera. 16 17 It is never a pleasure to sentence anybody to 18 incarceration, but the crime you committed deserves a severe 19 punishment. There will be people who will suffer other than 20 you as a result of this sentence, but the person that you 2.1 should blame for that is the one you see in the mirror, not 22 anyone else. Because any hardship that is caused to your 23 family, your parents, your children, your wife has been caused 24 by you, not by society, not by this Court, not by the 25 government, not by anyone else but you. The spreading of

heroin in the Lowell and Fitchburg area is just as bad as if you had distributed poison to those people. Young people who become addicts have no choice in the matter. You make them dependent on this drug. You and anyone else that participate in conspiracies to distribute this drug deserve to get thrown in jail for a long period of time.

The only reason why I am going to not go to the high end of the guideline is because I think you have shown an ability when you apply yourself to be a decent human being and to conduct yourself in a way that could be productive. You apparently have had a good employment record for most of the last 10 or 12 years. How you got involved in this or why you got involved is totally unclear and unexcusable. But this is the last clear chance you have. You're going to go to jail for a long period of time, but you'll still be a young man when you get out. You'll still have the opportunity to participate in the society and do something good for your family and for the people around you, but you're going to have a long time to think about it. If you ever are in this court again on a similar charge, you will go to jail for the rest of your life. I hope you understand that.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 and having considered the sentencing factors enumerated in Title 18 of the United States Code Section 3553(a), it is the judgment of this Court that you, Reynaldo Rivera, are hereby committed

2.1

2.1

to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 88 months. This term consists of terms of 88 months on each count to be served concurrently. The Court makes a judicial recommendation that you participate in the Bureau of Prisons' 500-hour residential drug abuse program.

Upon release from imprisonment, you shall be placed on supervised release for a term of four years. This term consists of terms of four years on each count, all such terms to run concurrently. Within 72 hours of release from custody of the Bureau of Prisons, you shall report in person to the district to which you are released.

No fine is imposed based upon this Court's finding that you are unable to pay a fine and are unlikely to become able to pay a fine.

While on supervised release, you shall comply with the following terms and conditions: First, you shall not commit another federal, state or local crime and shall not illegally possess a controlled substance. Second, you shall refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance and submit to one drug test within 15 days of release from imprisonment and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter, not to exceed 50 tests per year as directed by the probation office. Third, you are to submit to the collection of a DNA sample as directed by the probation office. Fourth, you shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by

this Court and are described in the Sentencing Guidelines at Section 5D1.3(c) and will be set forth in detail in the judgment and committal.

You are prohibited from possessing a firearm, destructive device or other dangerous weapon. You are not to consume any alcoholic beverages. You are to participate in a program for substance abuse counseling as directed by the United States probation office, which program may include testing, not to exceed 50 tests per year, to determine whether you have reverted to the use of alcohol or drugs. You shall be required to contribute to the cost of services for such treatment based upon your ability to pay or the availability of third-party payment.

It is further ordered that you shall pay to the United States a special assessment of \$600, which shall be due and payable immediately.

Mr. Rivera, you have a right to appeal this sentence. If you choose to appeal, you must do so within ten days. If you cannot afford an attorney, an attorney will be appointed on your behalf.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Is there any further business to come before the Court? Mr. Bloomer.

MR. BLOOMER: Four years supervised release, your

2.1

```
Honor?
 1
 2
                  THE COURT: Did I not say that?
                  MR. DONALDSON: That's what I heard.
 3
                  THE COURT: I did say that, I believe. Four years
 4
 5
      supervised release.
 6
                  MR. BLOOMER: Nothing further, your Honor.
 7
                  MR. DONALDSON: Your Honor, I have something.
                  THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Donaldson.
 8
 9
                  MR. DONALDSON: As part and parcel of Mr. Rivera's
10
      pretrial release, his family put their house up. Do you
11
      want -- should I by motion request that the lien on the
12
      property be released?
13
                  THE COURT: Yes, that is done by motion. And the
14
      motion when it is properly filed will be allowed.
15
                  MR. DONALDSON: Thank you, your Honor.
16
                  THE CLERK: The defendant is remanded to custody of
17
      the U.S. Marshal. All rise.
18
                  (Adjourned, 4:49 p.m.)
19
20
                             CERTIFICATION
21
                  I certify that the foregoing is a correct
      transcript of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled
22
      matter to the best of my skill ability.
23
     /s/ Shelly M. Killian
2.4
     Shelly M. Killian RPR, CM, CRR
25
     Registered Professional Reporter
     May 24, 2008
```